

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated April 18, 2007. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11-15, 18, 19, 21, and 23-30 are pending. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11-15, 18, 19, 21, and 23-30 are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 13, 15, 18, 19, 25, 27, and 29 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11-15, 18, 19, 21, and 23-30 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1 and 13 are amended to recite modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in the adapter API to convert the data in the respective data sources into XML format “according to a registered schema definition and a document type definition (DTD), to save the XML formatted data in XML files, and to have the XML formatted data in the XML files imported into a database on a server”, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources.

Claim 25 is amended to recite the portion of the client applications includes generation logic for making calls to the first set of methods in the adapter API, such that data in the respective data sources are converted into XML format “according to the corresponding schema definition and DTD, wherein the XML formatted data is stored in XML files, wherein the XML formatted data in the XML files is transferred to the server for storage in a database”, wherein the XML formatted XML data in the XML files is verified against the corresponding DTD prior to storage in the database, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources.

Claims 27-30 are objected to because of the following informalities. Accordingly, claim 27 has been amended to recite “the first set of methods and the second set of methods”.

Claims 1-3, 6, 10, 13-15, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being

anticipated by Sharma et al (US 2003/0204645; hereinafter Sharma). Claims 7, 11, 12, 19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma as applied to claims 6 and 18 above, and further in view of Chiang et al. (US 6,948,174; hereinafter Chiang). Applicant's amendments of claims 1 and 13 incorporate the limitation of an XML file, recited in claims 7 and 19. Applicant's arguments against the rejection of claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are thus combined.

The Examiner states:

... Sharma teaches: ... (b) modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in the adapter API to convert the data into the respective data sources into XML format and to have the XML formatted data imported into a database on a server, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources [¶ 115, 127]; ...

... Sharma fails to specifically disclose saving the XML format data in an XML file. However, Chiang teaches saving the XML format data in an XML file [col. 8 lines 2-16; col. 11 lines 18-40] ...

Chiang discloses a Common Application Metamodel (CAM) tool, method, and system for providing a data transformer that is bi-directional between a client application and a server application. At least one connector exists between the end user application and the application server. The application request from the first language of the first end user application is converted to the language running on the application server. The response to the application request is converted from the language running on the application server to the first language of the first end user application. (Col. 3, line 44 – col. 4, line 12) Figure 8 of Chiang illustrates the application of the CAM during run time, where SOAP compliant XML document 803 are received in a middleware 805, which is in contact with an XML repository 809, containing the XML instance files for the CAM model. Here, CAM facilitates connectivity between the back-end IMS application 815 and the web file 803. The CAM accomplishes this by using CAM model information to perform data transformations from one platform to another in the mixed language environment shown.

(Col. 11, lines 18-46)

In contrast, the present invention includes multiple client applications that convert data in respective data sources into XML format according to the same schema definition and DTD. The XML formatted data from the client applications are then saved in XML files. The XML formatted data in the XML files are then imported into a database on a server. Because each of the client applications convert their respective data into XML according to the same schema definition and DTD, the data stored in the database is standardized. Other client applications can then retrieve or export the data in the database without the need to know about the unconverted data format at any of the data sources of the other client applications. Data from the data sources is thus more easily accessible across client applications.

Although Chiang discloses the use of an XML file, Chiang does not use the XML file in this way or for this purpose. Chiang instead discloses using the XML file to convert languages between a user application and a server. Chiang is thus concerned with a user application and a server being able to communicate, not the accessibility of data between multiple user applications. Chiang does not use the XML file to enable data from data sources to be standardized across user applications.

Sharma in view of Chiang thus fails to teach or suggest providing an adapter API at each of the client applications that provides a first set of methods for the client applications to use to translate data in the respective data sources into XML format, and modifying each of the client applications to invoke the first set of methods in the adapter API to convert the data in the respective data sources into XML format according to a registered schema definition and a document type definition (DTD), to save the XML formatted data in XML files, and to have the XML formatted data in the XML files imported into a database on a server, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources, as recited in amended

independent claims 1 and 13.

Claims 1 and 13 are thus allowable over Sharma in view of Chiang.

Applicant submits that claims 2-3, 6, 10, 14-15, 18, and 22 are allowable because they depend on the allowable base claims 1 and 13.

Claims 9, 21, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Chiang as applied to claims 7 and 19 above, and further in view of Fry (US 6,880,125).

Claims 9 and 21 depend upon amended independent claims 1 and 13, respectively. Applicant submits that claims 1 and 13 are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Applicant further submits claims 9 and 21 are allowable because they depend on these allowable base claims.

Concerning claim 25, Applicant's arguments concerning Sharma in view of Chiang as applied to claims 7 and 19 above applies here with equal force. Sharma in view of Chiang thus fails to teach or suggest that at least a portion of the client applications includes a corresponding schema definition and document type definition (DTD) registered with the schema registry, and the portion of the client applications includes generation logic for making calls to the first set of methods in the adapter API, such that data in the respective data sources are converted into XML format according to the corresponding schema definition and DTD, wherein the XML formatted data is stored in XML files, wherein the XML formatted data in the XML files is transferred to the server for storage in a database, wherein the XML formatted XML data in the XML files is verified against the corresponding DTD prior to storage in the database, thereby standardizing the data from the data sources, as recited in amended independent claim 25.

A secondary reference stands or falls with the primary reference. Since Sharma in view of Chiang fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, Sharma in view of Chiang

further in view of Fry also fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, claim 25 is patentable over the references.

Applicant submits that claims 26-30 are allowable because they depend upon the allowable base claim 25.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11-15, 18, 19, 21, and 23-30 are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of these claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen G. Sullivan/
Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38329
Telephone No.: 650 969-7474

Date: June 18, 2007